UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,708	10/12/2001	Michael C. Dorsey	P6956	2164

7590 10/29/2004

MEYERTONS HOOD KIVLIN KOWERT & GOETZEL PC
ATTN: B Noel Kivlin
P O Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER	
TRIMMINGS, JOHN P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2133	

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/976,708	DORSEY, MICHAEL C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John P Trimmings	2133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 June 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3,14,* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10 June 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/10/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the applicant's amendment dated 6/10/2004.

Claims 1, 8, 12, 22, 24-26, 29 and 31 were amended.

Claims 1-33 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

The examiner acknowledges receipt of, and has considered, the Information Disclosure dated 6/10/2004.

Response to Amendment

1. The examiner withdraws all objections to the drawings and has approved the amended formal drawings submitted on 6/10/2004.

2. The examiner withdraws all objections to the Specification, and approves the amended Specification submitted on 6/10/2004.

3. As per Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112;

As per Claims 23 and 30:

In view of the applicant's amendment to Claims 23 and 30, the examiner's rejections to said claims are withdrawn.

As per Claim 26:

In view the applicant's amendment to Claim 26, the examiner believes that there remains an insufficient antecedent basis (see below).

4. Applicant's arguments, see amendment filed 6/10/2004, with respect to the rejections of independent claims 1, 8, 12, 22 and 29 under 35 USC § 103 have been

fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn, including all dependent claims following said independent claims. However, upon further consideration, a new ground for rejection is made in view of Udawatta et al. and Pouya et al. (see below).

Claim Objections

5. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 2 of the claim recites, "($x^{32} + X^{28} + x + 1$)". The capital "X" should be lower case "x". Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 1 of the claim recites, "the first primitive", but should read, "the second primitive". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. Claim 26 recites the limitation "the built-in self-test controller" in line 4 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNamara et al., U.S. Patent No. 6629281, in view of Heon-Cheol Kim, U.S. Patent No. 5938784, in view of Pouya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6701476, and further in view of Udawatta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6738939.

As per Claim 1, 5, 8 and 22:

McNamara et al. teaches a BIST method and controller (see Abstract and column 1 lines33-44) comprising a LBIST engine (column 3 lines 27-31) and means for executing a LBIST (column 4 lines 27-28 and line 43), including an LBIST state machine (column 1 lines 44-48). McNamara et al. also teaches a pattern generator (column 1 lines 60-61) and storing compressed signature results (column 1 lines 60-67) but fails to teach the pattern generator as being based on a 1st primitive polynomial, and the signature register to be a MISR, based on a 2nd primitive polynomial. In an analogous art, Kim teaches prior art and the Kim invention as having an LFSR (pattern generator) and a MISR, both being based on primitive polynomials (see Abstract, column 1 lines 33-59 and column 2 lines 1-6 and column s lines 20-67 and column 4 lines 1-28). And Kim, in column 1 lines 60-67 and column 2 lines 1-9 states that the invention reduces the number of dedicated logic for the BIST controller. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated as suggested by Kim, would combine the two references in order to build in more testing with less circuits. But the two references of McNamara et al. and Kim fail to teach the 1st and 2nd polynomials being a certain number of bits wherein the second polynomial has a number of bits different from the first. But Pouya et al. suggests that the polynomials (column 17 lines 1-67 and column 18 lines 1-35) be different polynomials (column 18 lines 36-41), but does not specifically state that they be different in the number of bits. Pouya et al., boasts of reduced test cost with this invention in column 1 lines 35-40. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated as suggested, would add the variable polynomial

capabilities of Pouya et al. to the above references in order to decrease test costs. In another analogous art, Udawatta et al. does teach the feature of the 1st polynomial bits being different in number than the 2nd in column 2 lines 17-67, where in column 3 lines 59-61 it is stated that the invention supports MISRs with different polynomial sizes. It is obvious that if a LFSR is included to two different sized MISRs, then at least one of the two MISRs will utilize a different sized polynomial than the LFSR. And column 3 lines 16-19 Udawatta et al. states the advantage of minimizing aliasing by increasing the length of the MISR. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated as suggested, would combine Udawata et al. with all the above references in order to improve aliasing performance, and so the claims are rejected.

As per Claims 3, 10, 24 and 25:

Dependent on Claims 1 or 8 or 22, the claims limit the 2nd primitive polynomial to $x^{32} + x^{28} + x + 1$. The primitive polynomials available to the user in Kim, due to the broad scope, includes this polynomial by default, and in view of the previous motivation in Claims 1, 8 and 22, the claims are rejected.

2. Claims 2, 9 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNamara et al., U.S. Patent No. 6629281, in view of Heon-Cheol Kim, U.S. Patent No. 5938784, in view of Pouya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6701476, and further in view of Udawatta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6738939 as applied to Claims 1 or 22, and further in view of Paul H. Bardell Jr., U.S. Patent No. 4959832. Dependent on Claims 1 or 8 or 22, the claims limit the 1st primitive polynomial to $x^{31} + x^3 + 1$. In an analogous art, Bardell Jr. teaches this specific primitive polynomial in column 8 line 36. And Bardell

Jr., in column 2 lines 29-67 recites the advantage of increased effectiveness in BIST by using the subject phase shift enhancement. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated to better BIST effectiveness as suggested, would combine the references, and so the claims are rejected.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNamara et al., U.S. Patent No. 6629281, in view of Heon-Cheol Kim, U.S. Patent No. 5938784, in view of Pouya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6701476, and further in view of Udawatta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6738939 as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of of Simpson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5260950, Wong et al., U.S. Patent No. 6636997, and Bogholtz et al., U.S. Patent No. 5357523. The LBIST state machine in Claim 1 is further limited to a reset state entered via an external signal. Simpson et al. enters a reset state (column 1 lines 24-36) via an external reset signal (Drawing, RESET 11), but does not begin initializing the device with an LBIST run signal. And Simpson et al., in column 1 lines 5-9 states the advantage of being able to provide a reset signal the circuit under test to a safe state. In McNamara et al. the device enters an initiate state subsequent to a start ABIST signal (column 2 lines 55-67), and suggests a similar LBIST in the same invention (column 3 lines 27-32). An analogous art, Wong et al. in column 6 lines 26-50 teaches the states of scan, step, and complete (done) as specified by the applicant's claim. Wong et al., in column 2 lines 62-67, describes an advantage of the invention as being capable of both pseudo-random and functional testing, but does not complete the test by comparing the pattern generator to a counter set-point. Lastly, an analogous art, Bogholtz et al., teaches ending the BIST

under the condition of comparing the pattern generator to a pre-set count (FIG.10 32 and column 8 lines 27-40), and column 2 lines 7-10 specify an advantage as being a way to flexibly configure the test parameters. And in view of the motivations stated within this paragraph, one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would combine all of the references above, and thus the claim is rejected.

4. Claims 7, 11 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNamara et al., U.S. Patent No. 6629281, in view of Heon-Cheol Kim, U.S. Patent No. 5938784, in view of Pouya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6701476, and further in view of Udawatta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6738939 as applied to Claims 1 or 8 or 22 above, and in view of Rajski et al., U.S. Patent No. 5991909. Dependent on Claims 1 or 8 or 22 above, the claims limit the seeding of the pattern generator to being externally configurable. In an analogous art, Rajski et al. sets the LFSR (column 7 lines 15-23) to an external seed (FIG.3 108) via an input port. And Rajski et al., in column 3 lines 31-34 recites the advantage of testing with variable reseeding that is compatible with JTAG protocols. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated by Rajski et al. as indicated, would combine the references, and so the claims are rejected.

5. Claims 6, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNamara et al., U.S. Patent No. 6629281, in view of Heon-Cheol Kim, U.S. Patent No. 5938784, in view of Pouya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6701476, and further in view of Udawatta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6738939, and further in view of Motika et al., U.S. Patent No. 5982189.

As per Claims 6, 17 and 27:

Dependent on Claims 1 or 12 or 22, the claims further limit the controller wherein the signature register includes a bit indicating the LBIST is done. Motika et al., in column 3 lines 39-67 and column 4 lines 1-5 teaches a LBIST where the signature includes a pass/fail indicator. A pass/fail indicator is the same as a test done indicator – the testing must be done if there is a pass/fail indication. And column 1 lines 65-67 specifies of Motika et al. recites an advantage to be a better stress test for circuits. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated by Motika et al., would combine the references, and so the claims are rejected.

As per Claim 12, 16 and 18:

McNamara et al. teaches a BIST controller (see Abstract and column 1 lines33-44) comprising a LBIST or MBIST engine (column 3 lines 27-31) and means for executing a LBIST or MBIST (column 4 lines 27-28 and line 43), including an LBIST or MBIST state machine (column 1 lines 44-48). McNamara et al. also teaches a pattern generator (column 1 lines 60-61) and storing compressed signature results (column 1 lines 60-67) but fails to teach the pattern generator as being based on a 1st primitive polynomial, and the signature register to be a MISR, based on a 2nd primitive polynomial. In an analogous art, Kim teaches prior art and the Kim invention as having an LFSR (pattern generator) and a MISR, both being based on primitive polynomials (see Abstract, column 1 lines 33-59 and column 2 lines 1-6 and column s lines 20-67 and column 4 lines 1-28). And Kim, in column 1 lines 60-67 and column 2 lines 1-9 states that the invention reduces the number of dedicated logic for the BIST controller. However, the references fail to teach a plurality of memory components, a logic core, and a testing

interface. In an analogous art, Motika et al. teaches these features in FIG.2 as memories (FIG.2 36), a logic core (FIG.2 38), and tester interface (FIG.2 60). One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated as suggested by Kim above and Motika et al. elsewhere in this office action would combine the two references in order to build in more testing with less circuits. But the above references of McNamara et al. and Kim fail to teach the 1st and 2nd polynomials being a certain number of bits wherein the second polynomial has a number of bits different from the first. But Pouya et al. suggests that the polynomials (column 17 lines 1-67 and column 18 lines 1-35) be different polynomials (column 18 lines 36-41), but does not specifically state that they be different in the number of bits. Pouya et al., boasts of reduced test cost with this invention in column 1 lines 35-40. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated as suggested, would add the variable polynomial capabilities of Pouya et al. to the above references in order to decrease test costs. In another analogous art, Udawatta et al. does teach the feature of the 1st polynomial bits being different in number than the 2nd in column 2 lines 17-67, where in column 3 lines 59-61 it is stated that the invention supports MISRs with different polynomial sizes. It is obvious that if a LFSR is included to two different sized MISRs, then at least one of the two MISRs will utilize a different sized polynomial than the LFSR. And column 3 lines 16-19 Udawatta et al. states the advantage of minimizing aliasing by increasing the length of the MISR. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated as suggested, would combine Udawata et al. with all the above references in order to improve aliasing performance, and so the claims are rejected.

As per Claim 14:

Dependent on Claim 12, the claim limits the 2nd primitive polynomial to $x^{32} + x^{28} + x + 1$. The primitive polynomials available to the user in Kim, due to the broad scope, includes this polynomial by default, and in view of the previous motivation in Claim 12, the claim is rejected.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNamara et al., U.S. Patent No. 6629281, in view of Heon-Cheol Kim, U.S. Patent No. 5938784, in view of Pouya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6701476, and further in view of Udawatta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6738939, and further in view of Motika et al., U.S. Patent No. 5982189 as applied to Claim 12, and further in view of Paul H. Bardell Jr., U.S. Patent No. 4959832. Dependent on Claim 12, the claim limits the 1st primitive polynomial to $x^{31} + x^3 + 1$. In an analogous art, Bardell Jr. teaches this specific primitive polynomial in column 8 line 36. And Bardell Jr., in column 2 lines 29-67 recites the advantage of increased effectiveness in BIST by using the subject phase shift enhancement. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated to better BIST effectiveness as suggested, would combine the references, and so the claim is rejected.

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNamara et al., U.S. Patent No. 6629281, in view of Heon-Cheol Kim, U.S. Patent No. 5938784, in view of Pouya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6701476, and further in view of Udawatta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6738939, and further in view of Motika et al., U.S. Patent No. 5982189 as applied to Claim 12 above, and further in view of of Simpson et

al., U.S. Patent No. 5260950, Wong et al., U.S. Patent No. 6636997, and Bogholtz et al., U.S. Patent No. 5357523. The LBIST state machine in Claim 12 is further limited to a reset state entered via an external signal. Simpson et al. enters a reset state (column 1 lines 24-36) via an external reset signal (Drawing, RESET 11), but does not begin initializing the device with an LBIST run signal. And Simpson et al., in column 1 lines 5-9 states the advantage of being able to provide a reset signal the circuit under test to a safe state. In McNamara et al. the device enters an initiate state subsequent to a start ABIST signal (column 2 lines 55-67), and suggests a similar LBIST in the same invention (column 3 lines 27-32). An analogous art, Wong et al. in column 6 lines 26-50 teaches the states of scan, step, and complete (done) as specified by the applicant's claim. Wong et al., in column 2 lines 62-67, describes an advantage of the invention as being capable of both pseudo-random and functional testing, but does not complete the test by comparing the pattern generator to a counter set-point. Lastly, an analogous art, Bogholtz et al., teaches ending the BIST under the condition of comparing the pattern generator to a pre-set count (FIG.10 32 and column 8 lines 27-40), and column 2 lines 7-10 specify an advantage as being a way to flexibly configure the test parameters. And in view of the motivations stated within this paragraph, one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would combine all of the references above, and thus the claim is rejected.

8. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNamara et al., U.S. Patent No. 6629281, in view of Heon-Cheol Kim, U.S. Patent No. 5938784, in view of Pouya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6701476, and further in view of

Udawatta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6738939, and in view of Motika et al., U.S. Patent No. 5982189 as applied to Claim 12 above, and further in view of Kim et al., U.S. Patent No. 6148426. Dependent on Claim 12, this claim limits a memory device to being a static random access memory. In an analogous art, Kim et al. teaches an MBIST (see Abstract) that is used for testing an SRAM (see Title). Citing a savings in BIST size and cost (column 2 lines 55-61), Kim et al. would motivate one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the art for the purpose of testing SRAM memories.

9. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNamara et al., U.S. Patent No. 6629281, in view of Heon-Cheol Kim, U.S. Patent No. 5938784, in view of Pouya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6701476, and further in view of Udawatta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6738939, and in view of Motika et al., U.S. Patent No. 5982189 as applied to Claim 12 above, and further in view of Au et al., U.S. Patent No. 6681359. Dependent on Claim 12, this claim limits a test interface to a JTAG TAP Controller. In Au et al., FIG.3 112 is a JTAG TAP Controller, and Au et al., in column 2 lines 18-27 in reciting the attributes of the invention, boasts of a better means to retrieve information within an MBIST while not requiring a large number of device pins. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated by Au et al., would combine the two references, thus the claims are rejected.

10. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNamara et al., U.S. Patent No. 6629281, in view of Heon-Cheol Kim, U.S. Patent No. 5938784, in view of Pouya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6701476, and further in view of Udawatta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6738939, and in view of Motika et al., U.S. Patent No.

5982189 as applied to Claim 12 above, and further in view of Rajski et al., U.S. Patent No. 5991909. Dependent on Claim 12 above, the claim limits the seeding of the pattern generator to being externally configurable. In an analogous art, Rajski et al. sets the LFSR (column 7 lines 15-23) to an external seed (FIG.3 108) via an input port. And Rajski et al., in column 3 lines 31-34 recites the advantage of testing with variable reseeding that is compatible with JTAG protocols. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated by Rajski et al. as indicated, would combine the references, and so the claims are rejected.

11. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNamara et al., U.S. Patent No. 6629281, in view of Heon-Cheol Kim, U.S. Patent No. 5938784, in view of Pouya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6701476, and further in view of Udawatta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6738939, as applied to Claim 22 above, and further in view of Wong et al., U.S. Patent No. 6636997, and Bogholtz et al., U.S. Patent No. 5357523. The LBIST method of Claim 22 is further defined whereas it initializes the device with an LBIST run signal. In McNamara et al. the device enters an initiate state subsequent to a start ABIST signal (column 2 lines 55-67), and suggests a similar LBIST in the same invention (column 3 lines 27-32). An analogous art, Wong et al. in column 6 lines 26-50 teaches the states of scan, step, and complete (done) as specified by the applicant's claim. Wong et al., in column 2 lines 62-67, describes an advantage of the invention as being capable of both pseudo-random and functional testing, but does not complete the test by comparing the pattern generator to a counter set-point. Lastly, an analogous art, Bogholtz et al., teaches ending the BIST under the condition of

comparing the pattern generator to a pre-set count (FIG.10 32 and column 8 lines 27-40), and column 2 lines 7-10 specify an advantage as being a way to flexibly configure the test parameters. And in view of the motivations stated within this paragraph, one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would combine all of the references above, and thus the claim is rejected.

12. Claims 29, 31, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Au et al., U.S. Patent No. 6681359, in view of Rajski et al., U.S. Patent No. 5991909, in view of Heon-Cheol Kim, U.S. Patent No. 5938784, in view of Pouya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6701476, and further in view of Udawatta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6738939.

As for Claim 29:

Au et al. teaches a method for testing an integrated circuit device (see Abstract), the method comprising: interfacing the integrated circuit device with a tester (column 8 lines 29-31); performing a built-in self-test (column 8 lines 56-58), and reading the indication (column 10 lines 21-26). Au et al. however fails to teach, seeding a pattern generator with a 1st polynomial, performing a LBIST and storing results in a MISR using a 2nd primitive polynomial. In an analogous art, Rajski et al. does teach seeding a pattern generator (FIG.3 106 and column 3 lines 59-62 and column 7 line 18) with any polynomial (column 8 line 64), performing a LBIST (column 1 lines 5-10), and storing results in a MISR (FIG.1 28), but does not teach using a primitive polynomial in the MISR. But Kim does teach using a primitive polynomial (see Kim Abstract). And in view of the motivation previously set forth for Rajski et al. and Kim, one with ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention would combine the references, motivated as suggested by Kim, in order to build in more testing with less circuits. But the two references of Au et al., Rajski et al., and Kim fail to teach the 1st and 2nd polynomials being a certain number of bits wherein the second polynomial has a number of bits different from the first. But Pouya et al. suggests that the polynomials (column 17 lines 1-67 and column 18 lines 1-35) be different polynomials (column 18 lines 36-41), but does not specifically state that they be different in the number of bits. Pouya et al., boasts of reduced test cost with this invention in column 1 lines 35-40. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated as suggested, would add the variable polynomial capabilities of Pouya et al. to the above references in order to decrease test costs. In another analogous art, Udawatta et al. does teach the feature of the 1st polynomial bits being different in number than the 2nd in column 2 lines 17-67, where in column 3 lines 59-61 it is stated that the invention supports MISRs with different polynomial sizes. It is obvious that if a LFSR is included to two different sized MISRs, then at least one of the two MISRs will utilize a different sized polynomial than the LFSR. And column 3 lines 16-19 Udawatta et al. states the advantage of minimizing aliasing by increasing the length of the MISR. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated as suggested, would combine Udawata et al. with all the above references in order to improve aliasing performance, and so the claim is rejected. As per Claim 31:

Dependent on Claim 29, the claim limits the 2nd primitive polynomial to $x^{32} + x^{28} + x + 1$. The primitive polynomials available to the user in Kim, due to the broad scope,

includes this polynomial by default, and in view of the previous motivation in Claims 29, the claim is rejected.

As per Claim 32:

The method of Claim 29 is limited to externally configuring the seed. Rajski et al., in FIG3 108 describes the same feature, and in view of the previous motivation, the claim is rejected.

As per Claim 33:

The method of Claim 29 is further limited to performing a MBIST. Au et al., describes this feature in the Abstract, and in view of the motivation previously mentioned, the claim is rejected.

13. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Au et al., U.S. Patent No. 6681359, in view of Rajski et al., U.S. Patent No. 5991909, and in view of Heon-Cheol Kim, U.S. Patent No. 5938784 as applied to Claim 29, and further in view of Paul H. Bardell Jr., U.S. Patent No. 4959832. Dependent on Claim 29, the claim limits the 1st primitive polynomial to $x^{31} + x^3 + 1$. In an analogous art, Bardell Jr. teaches this specific primitive polynomial in column 8 line 36. And Bardell Jr., in column 2 lines 29-67 recites the advantage of increased effectiveness in BIST by using the subject phase shift enhancement. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, motivated to better BIST effectiveness as suggested, would combine the references, and so the claim is rejected.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P Trimmings whose telephone number is 703-305-0714. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 7:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on 703-305-9595. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John P Trimmings
Examiner
Art Unit 2133

jpt

GUY J. LAMARRE
PRIMARY EXAMINER